

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

The drawings stand objected to because Figure 5 fails to show an element numbered 340.

Claims 1-5 and 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,559,904 to Kwak et al. (referred to as Kim et al. by the Examiner).

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 15-16 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,852,488 to Takemura.

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 15-16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,659,375 to Yamashita et al.

In a telephone conference with the Examiner on October 29, 2004, the Examiner acknowledge that he inadvertently omitted claims 11-14 in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, which rejects claims 1-5 and 15-19 over Kwak et al. Applicants respectfully request confirmation and acknowledgement that claims 11-14 should have been included in the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kwak et al.

**Proper Reference to U.S. Patent No. 6,559,904**

Although the Examiner refers to U.S. Patent No. 6,559,904 as Kim et al., Applicants presume that the Examiner actually meant Kwak et al. Applicants have also noted the comments regarding a taper shape on page 4 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner confirm that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should have referred to Kwak et al.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Paragraph [0039] of the specification has been amended to consistently designate storage capacitor electrode in Figure 5 as 525.

Claims 1, 11 and 15 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 2-5, 16 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1, 6-15 and 18-20 are presently pending for consideration on the merits.

**The Drawings Do Not Contain Objectionable Subject Matter**

The drawings stand objected to because Figure 5 fails to show an element numbered 340 and because Figure 5 shows reference element “525” that is not mentioned in the specification. Applicants respectfully assert that paragraph [0039] of the specification, as originally filed, referred to the storage capacitor electrode as being reference element “525”. Further, the specification has been amended to correct a few obvious errors that improperly designates the storage capacitor electrode in Figure 5 as being element 340, which does not exist in Figure 5. Paragraph [0039] initially identifies the storage capacitor electrode as the element numbered 525 but then later improperly designates the storage capacitor electrode as an element numbered 340, which is not in Figure 5. By way of the foregoing amendment, the specification now consistently designates storage capacitor electrode as the element numbered 525 in Figure 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

**All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-5 and 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,559,904 to Kwak et al. (referred to as Kim et al. by the Examiner). To the extent that this rejection might be reapplied to these claims 1 and 15, as newly amended, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as being based upon a reference that does not anticipate all of the features recited in newly amended independent claims 1 and 15. With regard to independent claim 1, as newly amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Kwak et al. does not anticipate a claimed combination including at least the recited feature of “a first parasitic capacitance generated by the pixel electrode overlapping a first area of a data line for the corresponding pixel area and a second parasitic capacitance generated by the pixel electrode overlapping a second area of a data line for an adjacent pixel area are substantially equal to each other; and the first area has a first shape and the second area has a second shape that is different from the first shape.” With regard to independent claim 15, as newly amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Kwak et al. does not anticipate a claimed combination including at least the recited feature of “a first area of a data line for the corresponding pixel area overlapped with the pixel electrode and a second area of a data line for an adjacent pixel area overlapped with the pixel electrode are substantially equal to each other and have different shapes.”

The Office Action appears to allege that Kwak et al. discloses the present invention defined in newly amend independent claims 1 and 15 by citing to Figures 1- 5 of Kwak et al. Applicants respectfully submit that Figures 1-5 of Kwak et al. do not anticipate the present invention defined in independent claims 1 and 15, as newly-amended. In contrast to the

presently claimed invention the first and second overlap areas shown in Figure 3 of Kwak et al. are the same shape. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the first and second overlap areas shown in Figure 6 of Kwak et al. are the same shape with different orientations. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Kondo fails to teach the first and second overlap areas having different shapes, as now defined by newly-amended independent claims 1 and 15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Kwak et al. does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 15, as newly-amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Applicants also respectfully assert that dependent claims 2 to 10 and 16 to 20 are allowable at least because of their respective dependency on newly amended independent claims 1 and 15, and for the additional features that they recite.

By way of the foregoing amendment, claim 11 has been amended to recite, amongst other features, a "pixel electrode having a first portion with a taper shape overlapping a data line of an adjacent pixel area and a second portion with a rectangular shape overlapping a data line for the corresponding pixel area." Applicants respectfully submit that Kwak et al. does not anticipate such a claimed combination of features because, as discussed above, Kwak et al. discloses first and second overlap areas that are the same shape. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert

that Kwak et al. does not anticipate each and every feature of independent claim 11, as newly-amended. Applicants also respectfully assert that dependent claims 12 to 14 are allowable at least because of their respective dependency on newly amended independent claim 11 and for the additional features that they recite.

**All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 15-16 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,852,488 to Takemura. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 15-16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,659,375 to Yamashita et al. To the extent that these rejections might be reapplied to independent claims 1 and 15, as newly amended, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as being based upon references that do not anticipate all of the features recited in newly amended independent claims 1 and 15. With regard to independent claims 1 and 15, as newly amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Takemura and Yamashita et al. do not anticipate a claimed combination including at least the recited features of a “pixel electrode...having an opening around the switching device corresponding to the pixel area” together with “a protrusion from one of the data lines is overlapped by the pixel electrode and has an area overlapped with the pixel electrode that is a portion of one of the first and second areas.”

The Office Action appears to allege that Takemura and Yamashita et al. disclose the present invention defined in newly amend independent claims 1 and 15 by citing to Figures 4 and 5 of Takemura and Figures 1-4, 8 and 9 of Yamashita et al. Applicants respectfully submit

that none of the figures in Takemura or Yamashita et al. anticipate the present invention defined in independent claims 1 and 15, as newly-amended. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Takemura nor Yamashita et al. disclose a “pixel electrode...having an opening around the switching device corresponding to the pixel area” together with “a protrusion from one of the data lines having an area overlapped with the pixel electrode that is a portion of one of the first and second areas.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Takemura and Yamashita et al. fail to anticipate the present invention, as now defined by newly-amended independent claims 1 and 15. Applicants also respectfully assert that dependent claims 2 to 10 and 16 to 20 are allowable at least because of their respective dependency on newly amended independent claims 1 and 15, and for the additional features that they recite. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections based upon Takemura and Yamashita et al. be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: Donald L. Monin, Jr.  
Donald L. Monin, Jr.  
Reg. No. 47,256

Dated: January 21, 2005

Customer No.: 009629  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202-739-7000  
Facsimile: 202-739-3001